

REMARKS

Status

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated May 8, 2006, in which Claims 1-7, 12-15, 21-32, 35-38 and 40-43 were rejected. Claims 1-20, 22, and 27-43 have been canceled; Claim 21 has been amended to incorporate the features of canceled Claim 22; and no new claims have been added. Accordingly, Claims 21 and 23-26 are pending in the application, and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action indicates that Claim 22 appears to be allowable if the 35 USC 112 issues are resolved and the claim is rewritten in independent form. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowance of this claim.

Claim 21 has been amended to include the feature of Claim 22 (now canceled), and Claim 21 has been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph and second paragraph (as noted below). Accordingly, Claim 21 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 23-26 are dependent on Claim 21, and therefore include all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 21, Claims 23-26 are also believed to be patentable.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-7, 12-15, 21-32, 35-38, and 40-43 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement and failing to comply with the written description requirement. As best understood, the Office Action seeks clarification on how a signature is without image content.

In order to promote prosecution of the present application, and without conceding either the correctness of the Office Action's position or the need for amendment for patentability reasons, Applicants have canceled Claims 1-7, 12-15, 27-32, 35-38, and 40-43.

Claim 21 has been amended to remove the phrase "without image content". As such, pending independent Claim 21 is believed to comply with 35

USC 112, first paragraph. Claims 23-26 are dependent on Claim 21 and do not include this language, and are therefore believed to comply with 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-7, 12-15, 21-32, 35-38, and 40-43 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards a the invention. As best understood, the Office Action seeks clarification on the feature “storing the signature data”.

In order to promote prosecution of the present application, and without conceding either the correctness of the Office Action’s position or the need for amendment for patentability reasons, Applicants have canceled Claims 1-7, 12-15, 27-32, 35-38, and 40-43.

Claim 21 has been amended to indicate that “the signature data” refers to the “one signature data”. As such, pending Claim 21 is believed to comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 23-26 are dependent on Claim 21 and do not include this language, and are therefore believed to comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 12-15, 21-32, and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards a the invention. As best understood, the Office Action seeks clarification on whether the digital still image is authenticated at the authentication location.

In order to promote prosecution of the present application, and without conceding either the correctness of the Office Action’s position or the need for amendment for patentability reasons, Applicants have canceled Claims 12-15, 27-32, and 35-36.

Claim 21 has been amended to indicate that the digital still image is authenticated at the authentication location. More particularly, Claim 21 now

recites the step as “at the authentication location, applying the one signature data to the digital still image to be authenticated to produce a verification signature”. As such, pending Claim 21 is believed to comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 23-26 are dependent on Claim 21 and are therefore believed to comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 101

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 USC 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 37 has been canceled, and accordingly this rejection is moot.

Claim Objections

Claim 30 is objected to because of informalities. Claim 30 has been canceled, and accordingly this objection is moot.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 102 - *Kaplan*

Claims 1, 5, 7, 21, 23-31, 35-38, and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 2002/0023220 (*Kaplan*).

In order to promote prosecution of the present application, and without conceding either the correctness of the Office Action’s position or the need for amendment for patentability reasons, Applicants have canceled Claims 1, 5, 7, 27-31, 35-38, and 40-41, and accordingly this rejection is moot with respect to these claims.

Claims 23-26 are dependent on allowable rewritten independent Claim 21, and therefore includes all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 21, Claims 23-26 are believed to be patentable.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 102 - *Cromer*

Claims 12-13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 2002/0083323 (*Cromer*).

In order to promote prosecution of the present application, and without conceding either the correctness of the Office Action’s position or the

need for amendment for patentability reasons, Applicants have canceled Claims 12-13 and 15. Accordingly this rejection is moot.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103 - *Kaplan*

Claims 2-4 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over *Kaplan*.

In order to promote prosecution of the present application, and without conceding either the correctness of the Office Action's position or the need for amendment for patentability reasons, Applicants have canceled Claims 2-4, and accordingly this rejection is moot with respect to these claims.

Claim 24 is dependent on allowable rewritten independent Claim 21, and therefore includes all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 21, Claim 24 is believed to be patentable.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103 – *Kaplan/Lambert*

Claims 6 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over *Kaplan* in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0007128 (*Lambert*).

In order to promote prosecution of the present application, and without conceding either the correctness of the Office Action's position or the need for amendment for patentability reasons, Applicants have canceled Claim 6, and accordingly this rejection is moot with respect to this claim.

Claim 26 is dependent on allowable rewritten independent Claim 21, and therefore includes all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 21, Claim 26 is believed to be patentable.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103 – *Cromer/Schneier*

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over *Cromer* in view of "Applied Cryptography" by Schneier.

In order to promote prosecution of the present application, and without conceding either the correctness of the Office Action's position or the need for amendment for patentability reasons, Applicants have canceled Claim 14, and accordingly this rejection is moot with respect to this claim.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103 – *Kaplan/Schneier*

Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over *Kaplan* in view of “Applied Cryptography” by Schneier.

In order to promote prosecution of the present application, and without conceding either the correctness of the Office Action’s position or the need for amendment for patentability reasons, Applicants have canceled Claim 32, and accordingly this rejection is moot with respect to this claim.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103 – *Kaplan/Menezes*

Claims 42-43 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over *Kaplan* in view of “Handbook of Applied Cryptography” by Menezes.

In order to promote prosecution of the present application, and without conceding either the correctness of the Office Action’s position or the need for amendment for patentability reasons, Applicants have canceled Claims 42-43, and accordingly this rejection is moot with respect to these claims.


Summary

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company Deposit Account No. 05-0225.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,324

Susan L. Parulski/law
Rochester, NY 14650-2201
Telephone: (585) 477-4027
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646